



AF

PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS: MARKUS HAMULSKI ET AL. - 5 (RCE)
SERIAL NO.: 10/628,799 EXAMINER: Daniel R. ZIRKER
FILED: JULY 28, 2003 GROUP: 1711
TITLE: SELF-ADHESIVE SURFACE PROTECTION FILM

LETTER TRANSMITTING APPEAL BRIEF AND FEE


MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Enclosed are three copies of Appellant's Brief in the above-identified appeal.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$510.00 to cover the Official fee for filing an Appeal Brief. Fee deficiencies, if any, should be charged to Deposit Account No. 03-2468.

Respectfully submitted,
Markus HAMULSKI ET AL.



Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg.No.29,298
Attorneys for Applicants

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802
FJD:djp

Enclosure: Appeal Brief
Check in the amount of \$510.00

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 14, 2007.


Amy Klein



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of: HAMULSKI ET AL. - 5 (RCE)
Serial No.: 10/628,799 Group No.: 1771
Filed: JULY 28, 2003 Examiner: Daniel R. ZIRKER
For: SELF-ADHESIVE SURFACE PROTECTION FILM

MAILSTOP: APPEAL BRIEF
Hon. Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 41.37(c), the following items under appropriate headings are provided for this appeal from the final rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-13 dated March 15, 2007.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is the assignee, Nordenia Deutschland Gronau GmbH.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The Appellant and the Appellant's legal representatives know of no other appeals and interferences which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 6-7 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 14 and 15 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-5 and 8-13 were finally rejected in an Office Action dated March 15, 2007. No claims have been allowed. The appealed claims are 1-5 and 8-13.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were filed after the March 15, 2007 Final Office Action. An amendment filed prior to the Final Office Action on December 26, 2006 has been entered. The December 26, 2006 Amendment amended claims 1-3.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

As set forth in independent claim 1, the present invention provides a self-adhesive surface protection film including a layered laminate produced by coextrusion. The laminate includes a carrier layer and an adhesive layer. See, e.g., Specification page 3, first paragraph after the heading "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" (lines 5-9) and the paragraph bridging pages 3-4 (page 3, line 10 to page 4, line 9).

The adhesive layer consists of a styrene block copolymer and at least one polyolefin, which may be a polyethylene or a polypropylene, and the styrene block copolymer is not plasticized with oils or resins. See, e.g., Specification paragraph bridging pages 3-4 (page 3, line 10 to page 4, line 9) and page 4, last paragraph (lines 10-21).

The adhesive properties of the adhesive layer **are governed** by the styrene block copolymer whereas a polyolefin selected from the group consisting of polyethylene and

polypropylene is added to **reduce** the adhesive strength to a predefined value. The named polyolefins are inexpensive, particularly suitable for extrusion, and provide a good bond with a multiplicity of other polymers that might be used for the adjacent layer of the laminate. See, e.g., Specification paragraph bridging pages 3-4 (page 3, line 10 to page 4, line 9), page 5, first paragraph (lines 1-18), and the paragraph bridging pages 6-7 (page 6, line 16 to page 7, line 8).

In this way, Appellants' invention provides a self-adhesive surface protection film that provides a good bond between the layers, can be produced in a simple manner by an inexpensive and variable coextrusion process, and is suitable for temporary protection of painted sheet metal as well as high-gloss sheet metal made of aluminum or stainless steel. See, e.g., Specification page 3, first paragraph after the heading "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" (lines 5-9), and the paragraph bridging pages 6-7 (page 6, line 16 to page 7, line 8).

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and specifies that the styrene block copolymer is selected from the group consisting of a styrene/isoprene/styrene (SIS) copolymer, a styrene/ethylene/butylene/styrene (SEBS) copolymer, a styrene/ethylene/propylene/styrene (SEPS) copolymer, and a styrene/butadiene/styrene (SBS) copolymer, or a mixture of one or more styrene block copolymers selected from said group. See, e.g., Specification paragraph bridging pages 3-4 (page 3, line 10 to page 4, line 9).

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1 and specifies that the styrene block copolymer is selected from the group consisting of a styrene/isoprene/styrene (SIS) copolymer, and a styrene/butadiene/styrene (SBS) copolymer, and having a di-block content of less than 15% by weight. Claim 4 is dependent of claim 3 and further specifies that the di-block

content is less than 1 % by weight. See, e.g., Specification page 4, last paragraph (lines 10-21).

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1 and specifies that the film has an adhesive strength after storage at room temperature for 24 hours of between 0.15 N/cm and 3.5 N/cm. See, e.g., Specification page 5, first paragraph (lines 1-18).

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1 and specifies that the carrier layer is made from a polyolefin. See, e.g., Specification paragraph bridging pages 5-6 (page 5, line 19 to page 6, line 2).

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 1 and specifies that the surface protection film further includes a bonding agent layer arranged between the carrier layer and the adhesive layer. See, e.g., Specification paragraph bridging pages 5-6 (page 5, line 19 to page 6, line 2).

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 1 and specifies that the carrier layer has a thickness of 20 to 80 μm and the adhesive layer has a thickness between 4 and 20 μm . See, e.g., Specification page 16, first full paragraph (lines 3-5).

Claim 11 is dependent on claim 1 and specifies that the layered laminate produced by coextrusion has a release layer on a side of the carrier layer facing away from the adhesive layer. Claim 12 is dependent on claim 11 and further specifies that the release layer includes a member selected from the group consisting of talcum, chalk, silicic acid, polyamide wax, and mixtures thereof. Claim 13 is also dependent on claim 1 and further specifies that the release layer has a micro-embossed surface produced by an embossing roller. See, e.g., Specification page 6, second full paragraph (lines 6-14).

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-5 and "7-13" (presumably claims 8-13 as claim 7 was previously canceled) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *European Patent Application Publication No. 0 661 364 to Koga et al* (U.S. equivalent *Koga et al U.S. Patent No. 5,567,515*) taken either individually, or in view of *Schurb U.S. Patent No. 5,496,601*. The Examiner has noted in particular the following portions of *EPA '364*: Abstract, page 2, lines 12-28, page 3, lines 5-10, lines 32-35, page 4, lines 16-25, line 35 - page 5 line 36, page 6, lines 6-10, lines 17-23, Example 6, Table 1, Examples 7-14, claims 1, 8-10.

The Examiner has taken the position that *EPA '364* discloses, in certain embodiments, a surface protective film comprising a base layer film whose composition can comprise a polyolefin and additionally features an adhesive layer that can be comprised of a blend of at least one α -olefin of 2 to 12 carbon atoms and which also comprises at least one block copolymer such as an SEBS or SIS block copolymer (e.g. the Examples), which in the Examiner's view is substantially all that Appellants' independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2 requires.

The Examiner has also taken the position that the amount of di-block copolymer content as set forth in Appellants' dependent claims 3 and 4 and what is called the performance parameter regarding adhesive strength set forth in Appellants' dependent claim 5, are, if not inherent, at most an obvious optimization to one of ordinary skill. The Examiner has also taken the position with respect to claims 9 and 10 that *EPA '364* discloses bonding layers, i.e primer layers (claim 9) and the thickness layer range of claim 10.

The Examiner has also taken the position that the presence of the release layer composition set forth in claims 11-12 and the use of microembossed surfaces set forth in claim 13 are conventional in the adhesive sheet art, in the absence of unexpected results.

The Examiner has recognized that the first adhesive component of *EPA '364* relied on by the Examiner in making his rejection (styrene block copolymers are said to also be prominently taught by *EPA '364* as a second adhesive component) is not either of the polyolefins (polyethylene or polypropylene) as Appellants claim, but rather an alpha olefin copolymer based upon at least two alpha olefins (such as PE or PP) having 2-12 carbon atoms. According to the Examiner, however, such alpha olefin copolymers are structurally similar to polyethylene and polypropylene, page 4, lines 6-8 of Appellants' disclosure teaches that alpha olefins in general are particularly suitable, and the only example in Appellants' disclosure uses LDPE as its polyolefin adhesive component. Such teachings are said to justify the Examiner's reliance on *EPA '364* for obviousness purposes as meeting the essential requirement of Appellants' claims because *EPA '364* is said to teach that such poly alpha olefins which include ethylene and polypropylene copolymers are particularly suitable for forming adhesives in a mixture with styrene block copolymers.

The Examiner has also taken the position that because *EPA '364* teaches at page 5, lines 47-55 that other auxiliaries such as either tackifiers and/or plasticizers may be present, such auxiliaries are not necessarily required to be present, which the Examiner considers relevant in view of the closed claim language for the adhesive layer. The Examiner recognizes that the closed claim language precludes the presence of these auxiliaries in the adhesive mixture even if, in the Examiner's view, it has not been proven

on the record that tackifiers, as well as all oils and/or resins plasticize the styrene block copolymer component.

As an alternative, the Examiner has relied upon a combination of *EPA '364* with *Schurb* where *Schurb* is relied upon as disclosing a closely related adhesive sheet having a non extrudable, i.e. paper based backing, and as further teaching at Col. 5, lines 39-61 that suitable pressure sensitive adhesive sheets can be coated with a variety of single or mixture based compositions wherein the adhesive mixture may include styrene based block copolymers such as S-I-S or styrene butadiene components, as well as (line 54) poly alpha olefin and/or amorphous polyolefin components. According to the Examiner, one of ordinary skill, motivated by an expectation of improved adhesive performance of what the Examiner calls these two very similar compositions which have virtually identical utilities would have ample motivation to incorporate the polyolefin adhesive based components of *Schurb* in place of the alpha olefin copolymer components of *EPA '364* and thereby form the claimed genus of adhesive sheets.

With respect to the dependent claims, the particular styrene based block copolymer component (claims 2-4), the adhesive strength parameter of claim 5, and further variables such as thicknesses, release layers and components, embossments and the like are each considered by the Examiner to be obvious modifications to one of ordinary skill in the absence of unexpected results. The Examiner also has taken the position that *Schurb* also teaches at Col. 6 the presence of such auxiliaries as release coats, primers, thicknesses and the like.

ARGUMENT

Claims 1-5 and 8-13 Are Patentable Over *EPA '364*

As to independent claim 1 and claims 2-5 and 8-13 which depend directly or indirectly thereon, the Examiner has based his rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in part on *EPA '364* individually despite the Examiner's recognition that Appellants' invention as recited in claim 1 relates to a film with an adhesive layer with a mixture of (a) styrene block copolymers and (b) polyethylene **or** polypropylene (homopolymer) whereas *EPA '364* teaches alpha olefin **copolymers** based upon **at least two** (different) alpha olefins having 2-12 carbon atoms.

EPA '364 relates to a surface protecting film comprising at least a base layer and an adhesive layer. See, e.g. Abstract. The adhesive layer "***is chiefly composed of a copolymer that is based on at least two α -olefins selected from among α -olefins having 2-12 carbon atoms.***" See page 4, lines 19-22 and claim 1 of *EPA '364* (emphasis added).

In a preferred embodiment, the adhesive layer of *EPA '364* is even composed of a ternary copolymer. See page 4, line 26. The adhesive properties of the adhesive layer of *EPA '364* **are governed** by these complicated structures and rather expensive **copolymers**. The use of an additional α -olefin component like styrene-diene based copolymers is only optional. As the adhesive properties are governed by "*a copolymer that is based on at least two α -olefins,*" the amount of an additional α -olefin component is preferably small.

According to *EPA '364*, the good adhesive properties of the disclosed film are achieved by using this **copolymer** as the chief component in the adhesive layer, and the

corresponding feature is mentioned in independent claim 1, the description and ***all*** examples ***including the comparative examples***. The use of simple polyethylene or polypropylene homopolymer is nowhere disclosed or suggested. None of the compositions of the adhesive layer described in *EPA '364* includes an admixture of one of these simple polyolefins. Instead, a complicated and rather expensive copolymer is ***necessarily a component of the adhesive layer disclosed in EPA '364***.

Contrary to the Examiner's position, there is no structural or functional similarity between copolymers based upon at least two alpha olefins having 2-12 carbon atoms and simple homopolymers. The production of the homopolymers polyethylene and polypropylene is easier and cheaper than the production of the copolymers suggested by *EPA '364*. Furthermore, polyethylene and polypropylene do not show noteworthy adhesive properties, and it is respectfully submitted that a person skilled in the art would not consider replacing the tacky copolymers disclosed by *EPA '364* with the simple homopolymer polyethylene or polypropylene.

Appellants' self-adhesive surface film as recited in claim 1 and the surface protective film of *EPA '364* are based on completely different approaches. According to *EPA '364*, the adhesive properties are achieved by a specific copolymer based upon two alpha olefins, wherein the composition is further limited by physical properties such as the initial tack and the crystallinity. Different admixtures might be optionally used in addition to the copolymer as chief component to adjust the properties. In contrast, with Appellants' self-adhesive surface protection film, the adhesive properties are achieved by styrene block

copolymers, wherein the non adhesive homopolymers of ethylene or propylene are used to modify, i.e. reduce the adhesive weight.

According to the Examiner's argument set forth at paragraph 2 of the March 15, 2007 Final Office Action, Appellants' film is considered obvious because Appellants' disclosure at page 4, lines 6-8 mentions alpha olefins in general in the description of the invention. This embodiment, however, is **not** included in the scope of independent claim 1, and it is respectfully submitted that it is incorrect to judge the obviousness of Appellants' claims on the basis of Appellants' own disclosure. Not only is the Examiner's reliance on Appellants' own disclosure inadequate by itself, but also such reliance flies in the face of *EPA '364*'s own teaching that the adhesive layer is to be based on a copolymer based upon at least two alpha olefins. In view of this teaching, it is respectfully submitted that the achievement of good adhesive properties from the mixture as recited in Appellants' claim 1 of styrene block copolymers with a simple homopolymer (PE or PP) is an entirely unexpected result which nowhere could be gleaned from anything taught by *EPA '364*.

Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5 and 8-13 on the basis of obviousness over *EPA '364* taken individually was in error and should be reversed.

**Claims 1-5 and 8-13 Are
Patentable Over *EPA '364* in View of *Schurb***

In rejecting claims 1-5 and 8-13, the Examiner alternatively relies on a combination of *EPA '364* with *Schurb*, citing *Schurb* as disclosing at col. 5, lines 39-61 what the Examiner calls a "closely related" pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet having a non

extrudable, i.e. paper based backing that can be coated with a variety of single or mixture based compositions wherein the adhesive mixture may include styrene based block copolymers such as S-I-S or styrene butadiene components as well as (line 54) poly alpha olefin and/or amorphous polyolefin components. *EPA '364* has been discussed above, and it is respectfully submitted that the arguments with respect to *EPA '364* alone, and particularly the differences between *EPA '364* and Appellants' film as recited in claim 1, apply equally to the combination of *EPA '364* with *Schurb*.

Schurb relates to an extensible flatback adhesive sheet of an adhesive tape, not to a surface protective film. The material disclosed by *Schurb* comprises a non-creped flatback paper backing of cellulosic fibers. This material cannot be formed by extrusion as recited in Appellants' claim 1. Moreover, the mere statement at col. 5, line 47 in *Schurb* that useful adhesives "may be **based** on" several different polymers – without any further explanation – cannot provide any guidance to one skilled in the art to construct a self-adhesive surface protection film comprising a layered laminate produced by coextrusion including an adhesive layer consisting of a styrene block copolymer and a polyethylene or a polypropylene. A specific composition and especially a sheet consisting of a) styrene block copolymers and b) polyethylene **or** polypropylene is nowhere disclosed or suggested by *Schurb*.

Thus, there is nothing disclosed or suggested in *Schurb* that would lead one skilled in the art to make the combination suggested by the Examiner. In fact, because *EPA '364* teaches the importance of using an adhesive layer chiefly composed of an alpha olefin **copolymer** that is based on at least two different alpha olefins selected from among alpha

olefins having 2-12 carbon atoms to achieve the adhesive properties of the *EPA '364* film, one skilled in the art would be led away from changing *EPA '364*'s adhesive layer by using the less adhesive homopolymers polyethylene or polypropylene.

Moreover, even if *Schurb*'s general statement that its adhesive may be **based** on several different polymers including poly-alpha-olefin and amorphous polyolefin were to be considered a disclosure of the use of the homopolymers polyethylene or polypropylene in *Schurb*'s nonextrudable adhesive sheet, one skilled in the art would still be led away from combining *Schurb* with *EPA '364* as one skilled in the art would recognize that polyethylene and polypropylene do not show noteworthy adhesive properties and would therefore be unsuitable for purposes of the *EPA '364* film.

Contrary to the Examiner's position, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have a reasonable expectation of improved adhesive performance in replacing the alpha olefin copolymer components of *EPA '364* with the polyolefin adhesive based components of *Schurb* to form a layered laminate produced by coextrusion having an adhesive layer consisting of a styrene block copolymer and at least one polyethylene or polypropylene polyolefin. *EPA '364* teaches away from using such homopolymers because his adhesive layer must be "chiefly composed of an α -olefin that is based on at least two α -olefins having 2-12 carbon atoms and which has a crystallinity of up to 10%, and said adhesive layer developing an initial tack of at least 20 g/25 mm when said film is attached to the surface of a stainless steel plate at 23°C." (Abstract, lines 2-5). In fact, *EPA '364* teaches that it is preferred to use a ternary copolymer at page 4, lines 26-27 and to add another

α -olefinic copolymer to the ternary copolymer at page 4, lines 35-37 in order to improve the adhesive performance of the adhesive layer.

**Claims 1-5 and 8-13 Are Patentable Over
Koga et al Taken Individually or in View of Schurb**

In rejecting claims 1-5 and 8-13, the Examiner has stated that *Koga et al* (which claims the same priority, JP 5-336419, as *EPA '364*), is the "US equivalent" and "cumulative" of *EPA '364*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the arguments with respect to *EPA '364* taken individually or in combination with *Schurb* apply equally to *Koga et al* and the combination of *Koga et al* with *Schurb*.

**The Examiner Incorrectly Relied On Hindsight For
The Obviousness Rejections of Claims 1-5 and 8-13
Based on *EPA '364 (or Koga et al)* alone or the
Combination of *EPA '364 (or Koga et al)* and *Schurb***

A claimed invention is unpatentable if the differences between it and the prior art "are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art...." 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As instructed by the Federal Circuit in *In Re Dembiczak*, 50 U.S.P.Q. 2d, 1614, 1616-17 (Fed. Cir. 1999), the phrase "at the time the invention was made" guards against entry into the tempting but forbidden zone of hindsight. Thus:

"Measuring a claimed invention against the standard established by §103 requires the oft-difficult but critical step of casting the mind back to the time of the invention, to consider the thinking of one of ordinary skill in the art, guided only by the prior art references and the then-accepted wisdom in the field. Close adherence to this methodology is expressly important in the case of less technologically complex inventions where the very ease of which the invention can be understood may prompt one 'to fall victim to the insidious effect of a hindsight syndrome wherein that which only the inventor taught is used against its teacher'".

50 U.S.P.Q. 2d at 16-17 (citations omitted).

It is respectfully submitted that in taking the position that *EPA '364* (or *Koga et al*) alone or in combination with *Schurb* teaches one skilled in the art to change the complicated structural and rather expensive copolymer of *EPA '364/Koga et al* having good adhesive properties to a simple homopolymer of polyethylene or polypropylene that does not have noteworthy adhesive properties, the Examiner is engaging in an impermissible retrospective view with knowledge of the invention in which the Examiner disregards the teaching of *EPA '364/Koga et al* of the need for copolymers based upon at least two alpha olefins having 2-12 carbon atoms to provide a surface protective film that has the properties sought by *EPA '364/Koga et al*. Contrary to the Examiner's position, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would have no reason to make the change proposed by the Examiner as none of the cited references teach the desirability of using such a simple homopolymer of polyethylene or polypropylene in a mixture with a styrene block copolymer to provide an adhesive layer for a self-adhesive surface protection film as recited in Appellants' claims and as only Appellants has taught.

The Examiner has the burden under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. This burden can be satisfied only by showing some objective teaching of the prior art, or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, that would lead that individual to modify the reference in the manner suggested by the Examiner. This the Examiner has not done. It is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion in any of the references that the copolymers of *EPA '364/Koga et al* were inadequate or should be modified in any way, let alone changed to a polyethylene or polypropylene homopolymer as suggested by the Examiner. To the contrary, *EPA '364/Koga et al* teaches away from using such simple homopolymers because of the

importance he places on the copolymers (and preferably the ternary copolymers) to provide the adhesive properties he requires for his film. Moreover, *EPA '364/Koga et al* also teaches away from using polyethylene or polypropylene in place of his copolymers because *EPA '364/Koga et al* teaches that the adhesive properties of his film are governed by such copolymers in imparting adhesive properties and one skilled in the art would recognize that polypropylene and polyethylene do not have noteworthy adhesive properties, which would render the use of such homopolymers in the *EPA '364/Koga et al* film undesirable. *Schurb* simply discloses an extensible flatback adhesive sheet of an adhesive tape that cannot be formed by extrusion and mentions, without any further explanation that the adhesive may be **based** on several different polymers. A specific composition consisting of styrene block copolymers and polyethylene or polypropylene is nowhere disclosed or suggested.

Perhaps the most blatant use of hindsight is the Examiner's reliance on Appellants' own disclosure at page 4, lines 6-8 of alpha olefins in general in making his obviousness rejections. A more telling example of the use of "that which only the inventor taught" being used against its teacher is difficult to imagine.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that there is nothing in any of *EPA '364/Koga et al*, and *Schurb* that would lead one skilled in the art to make the modifications proposed by the Examiner.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that they are entitled to a patent incorporating claims 1-5 and 8-13. A Claims Appendix containing a copy of the claims involved in the appeal is attached to this brief, submitted in triplicate. Evidence and Related Proceedings Appendices are also attached indicating "None." A remittance of

\$510.00 in payment of the official fee for a Large Entity is attached. Fee deficiencies, if any, should be charged to Deposit Account No. 03-2468.

Respectfully submitted,

Markus HAMULSKI ET AL.

BY:




Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No. 29,298
Elizabeth Collard Richter, Reg. No. 35,103
Attorneys for Applicants

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO.: 25889
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, NY 11576
516 365-9802

Enclosure: Claims Appendix, Evidence Appendix, Related Proceedings Appendix
Check in the amount of \$510.00

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 14, 2007.



Amy Klein

CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims 1-5 and 8-13

Claim 1: Self-adhesive surface protection film comprising a layered laminate produced by coextrusion, said laminate comprising:

- (a) a carrier layer and
- (b) an adhesive layer consisting of a styrene block copolymer and at least one polyolefin, said at least one polyolefin being selected from the group consisting of polyethylene and polypropylene, wherein the styrene block copolymer is not plasticized with oils or resins.

Claim 2: The surface protection film according to claim 1 wherein said styrene block copolymer is selected from the group consisting of:

a styrene/isoprene/styrene (SIS) copolymer,

a styrene/ethylene/butylene/styrene (SEBS) copolymer,

a styrene/ethylene/propylene/styrene (SEPS) copolymer, and

a styrene/butadiene/styrene (SBS) copolymer, or

a mixture of one or more styrene block copolymers selected from said group.

Claim 3: The surface protection film according to claim 1 wherein said styrene block copolymer is selected from the group consisting of:

a styrene/isoprene/styrene (SIS) copolymer, and

a styrene/butadiene/styrene (SBS) copolymer, and

having a di-block content of less than 15% by weight.

Claim 4: The surface protection film according to claim 3, wherein the di-block content is less than 1 % by weight.

Claim 5: The surface protection film according to claim 1 wherein said film has an adhesive strength after storage at room temperature for 24 hours of between 0.15 N/cm and 3.5 N/cm.

Claim 8: The surface protection film according to claim 1, wherein said carrier layer is made from a polyolefin.

Claim 9: The surface protection film according to claim 1, further comprising a bonding agent layer arranged between said carrier layer and said adhesive layer.

Claim 10: The surface protection film according to claim 1, wherein said carrier layer has a thickness of 20 to 80 μm and said adhesive layer has a thickness between 4 and 20 μm .

Claim 11: The surface protection film according to claim 1, wherein said layered laminate produced by coextrusion has a release layer on a side of said carrier layer facing away from said adhesive layer.

Claim 12: The surface protection film according to claim 11, wherein said release layer comprises a member selected from the group consisting of talcum, chalk, silicic acid, polyamide wax, and mixtures thereof.

Claim 13: The surface protection film according to claim 11, wherein said release layer has a micro-embossed surface produced by an embossing roller.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None